

REMARKS

Claims 1-67 were presented for examination and were pending in this application. In the latest Office Action, claims 1-67 were rejected. With this amendment, claims 1, 31, and 50 are amended. On the basis of the following remarks, consideration of this application and allowance of all pending claims are requested.

Each of the claims has been rejected as anticipated or made obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,106,457 to Perkins by itself, or made obvious by Perkins and U.S. Patent No. 5,093,730 to Ishii et al., either by themselves or in combination with other references.

Statement of Substance of Interview

On May 9, 2006, Applicants' representative Robert Hulse conducted an interview with examiner King Y. Poon. In this interview, the pending rejections of all claims were discussed.

During the interview, Applicants' representative highlighted the feature that the processing of the time-based media can be distributed across the printer and one or more computing devices on a network. This helps to relieve at least some of the processing load on external devices that the printer's additional functionality may require while also relieving the printer from having to take on the entire processing load itself, which could cause bottlenecking of print jobs at the printer.

Before this amendment, the claims recited that the processing of the time-based media is performed in part within a printing system and in part within a device coupled to the printing system via a network. In the previous Office Action, the examiner cited Perkins and/or Ishii for this distributed processing. Based on a broad interpretation of the term "processing," the

examiner reasoned, some amount of processing of the time-based media would necessarily be performed on software in a computer and some on a printer connected to the computer.

During the interview, Applicants' representative suggested that a distinguishing feature described in the present application is that the processing distributed between the printer and a network device is processing that is performed on the content of the time-based media. This processing, which recognizes the content of the time-based media and produces the printed representation based on that recognized content, was contrasted with the types of processing that would be performed by a printer in Perkins or Ishii — i.e., mere decoding, transcoding, scaling, and other types of processing that are independent of the actual content or meaning contained within the media.

During the interview, the examiner agreed that this feature would distinguish the claims from the cited references; however, an agreement was not reached as to any particular language that would make the claims allowable. The examiner stated that Applicants would “probably overcome” the cited references by reciting in the claims that the processing recognized content within the time-based media, and that the printed representation is then based on that recognized content. The examiner stressed, however, that whether the added limitations actually distinguish the claims would depend on the particular language chosen.

Based on this discussion, Applicants have amended each of the independent claims to recite that the claimed distributed processing recognizes content within the time-based media and that the printed representation is based on that recognized content. It is respectfully asserted that this added language limits the claims to subject matter that is distinguished from the cited references, as indicated by the examiner. For example, none of the cited references disclose that a printing system can process the time-based media to recognize the content therein and thereby

produce the printed representation. Therefore, the cited references do not disclose distributing this processing between the printer and one or more network devices.

It is understood that the allowance of the claims is subject to any further searches conducted by the examiner.

Based on the foregoing, the application is in condition for allowance of all claims, and a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. If the examiner believes for any reason direct contact would help advance the prosecution of this case to allowance, the examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

PETER E. HART, JONATHAN J. HULL, JAMEY
GRAHAM, AND KURT PERSOL

Dated: May 9, 2006

By: /Robert A. Hulse/

Robert A. Hulse, Reg. No. 48,473
Attorney for Applicant
Fenwick & West LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Tel.: (415) 875-2444
Fax: (415) 281-1350